

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Application Serial No. 09/817,808
Filing Date March 26, 2001
Inventorship McCartney, et al.
Applicant..... Microsoft Corporation
Group Art Unit.....2143
Examiner Shin, K. H.
Attorney's Docket No. MS1-0784US
Title: METHODS AND SYSTEMS FOR PROCESSING MEDIA CONTENT

APPEAL BRIEF

To: Commissioner for Patents
PO Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

From: Jeffrey Valley (Tel. 509-324-9256 x262; Fax 509-323-8979)
Customer No. 22801
Lee & Hayes, PLLC
421 W. Riverside Ave., Suite 500
Spokane, WA 99201

Pursuant to 37 C.F.R. §41.37, Appellant appeals to the Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences seeking review of the Examiner's rejections.

<u>Appeal Brief Items</u>	<u>Page</u>
(1) Real Party in Interest	3
(2) Related Appeals and Interferences	3
(3) Status of Claims	3
(4) Status of Amendments	4
(5) Summary of Claimed Subject Matter	4
(6) Grounds of Rejection to be Reviewed on Appeal	16
(7) Argument	16
(8) Appendix of Appealed Claims	44
(9) Evidence appendix	67
(10) Related proceedings appendix	68

(1) Real Party in Interest

The real party in interest is Microsoft Corporation, the assignee of all right, title and interest in and to the subject invention.

(2) Related Appeals and Interferences

Appellant is not aware of any other appeals, interferences, or judicial proceedings that will directly affect, be directly affected by, or otherwise have a bearing on the Board's decision to this pending appeal.

(3) Status of Claims

Claims 1-19, 21-27, 29-47, 51, 55-62, and 69-76 stand rejected and are pending in this Application. The rejections of Claims 1-19, 21-27, 29-47, 51, 55-62, and 69-76 are appealed. Claims 2-7, 11-18, 21-26, 30-34, 37-38, 40-46, 57-60, 62, 70-71, 73, and 75-76 are original and hence bear the designator "(Original)". Claims 20, 28, 48-50, 52-54, and 63-68 were previously canceled without prejudice.

The Claims pending in the Office Action at issue, including Appealed Claims 1-19, 21-27, 29-47, 51, 55-62, and 69-76 are set forth in the Appendix of Appealed Claims on page 38.

(4) Status of Amendments

A Final Office Action was issued on August 25, 2006. Appellant filed a response to the Final Office Action along with a Request for Continued Examination on November 20, 2006. The Non-final Office Action, which is the subject of this Appeal, was mailed January, 30 2007 (herein the “Office Action”). Appellant filed a Notice of Appeal dated July 13, 2007.

No amendments were made to the Claims subsequent to the non-final rejection.

(5) Summary of Claimed Subject Matter

A concise explanation of each independent claim is included in this Summary section, including specific reference characters and, in some cases, portions of the specification. These specific reference characters are examples of particular elements of the drawings for certain claimed embodiments. It is to be appreciated and understood that the claims are not to be limited to solely the elements corresponding to these reference characters or cited portions of the specification and that this section is provided to comply with the requirement of 37 CFR § 41.37(c)(1)(v).

Claim 1 recites a method of processing media content comprising: receiving a physical ID that corresponds to a specific media upon which content resides that can be experienced by a user (604 of Fig 6), attempting to map the physical ID to a logical ID (606 of Fig 6), if no logical ID is found that corresponds to the physical ID, attempting to establish a logical ID for the physical ID by causing a Wizard user

interface (UI) to be presented to a user via a client computer (700 of Fig. 7) so that information pertaining to the user's specific media can be collected from the user (702 of Fig. 7), and if a logical ID is found that corresponds to the physical ID (608 of Fig. 6), searching a database that contains metadata associated with the specific media by using the logical ID as a basis for a search query (610 of Fig. 6), wherein different instances of a specific media with the same content thereon are associated with different physical IDs that are mappable to the same logical (708, 710, 712 of Fig. 7).

Claim 8 recites a server (106 of Fig. 1, 200 of Fig. 2) comprising: one or more processors (202 of Fig. 2), one or more storage devices (108 of Fig. 1, 204, 228, 230, 234 of Fig. 2), and software code resident on the one or more storage devices (212, 214, 216, 218, and 220 of Fig. 2), which, when executed by the one or more processors (202 of Fig. 2), cause the processors to: receive a physical ID that corresponds to a specific media upon which content resides that can be experienced by a user (604 of Fig. 6), attempt to map the physical ID to a logical ID (606, 608 of Fig. 6), if no logical ID is found that corresponds to the physical ID, attempt to establish a logical ID for the physical ID by causing a Wizard user interface (UI) to be presented to a user via a client computer (700 of Fig. 7) so that information pertaining to the user's specific media can be collected from the user (702 of Fig. 7), if a logical ID is found that corresponds to the physical ID (608 of Fig. 6), search a database that contains metadata associated with the specific media by using the logical ID as a basis for a search query (610 of Fig. 6, 1300 of Fig. 13), format the metadata in a XML

schema (1304 of Fig. 13), and return the formatted metadata to a client (610 of Fig. 6, 1306 of Fig. 13), wherein different instances of a specific media with the same content thereon are associated with different physical IDs that are mappable to the same logical ID.

Claim 9 recites one or more computer-readable media having computer-readable instructions thereon (228, 232, 236 of Fig. 2) which, when executed by a computer (200 of Fig. 2), cause the computer (200 of Fig. 2) to: receive a physical ID that corresponds to a specific media upon which content resides that can be experienced by a user (604 of Fig. 6), attempt to map the physical ID to a logical ID (606 of Fig. 6), if no logical ID is found that corresponds to the physical ID, attempt to establish a logical ID for the physical ID by causing a user interface (UI) to be presented to a user via a client computer (700 of Fig. 7) so that information pertaining to the user's specific media can be collected from the user (702 of Fig. 7), if a logical ID is found that corresponds to the physical ID (608 of Fig. 6), search a database that contains metadata associated with the specific media by using the logical ID as a basis for a search query (610 of Fig. 6, 1300 of Fig. 13), format the metadata in a XML schema (1304 of Fig. 13), and return the formatted metadata to a client (610 of Fig. 6, 1306 of Fig. 13), wherein different instances of a specific media with the same content thereon are associated with different physical IDs that are mappable to the same logical ID (708, 710, 712 of Fig. 7).

Claim 10 recites a method of processing media content comprising: attempting to map a physical ID to a logical ID (404 of Fig. 4, 606 of Fig. 6), the physical ID corresponding to a specific media associated with content that can be experienced by a user (see Fig. 3), if no logical ID is found that corresponds to the physical ID, attempting to establish a logical ID for the physical ID by causing a user interface (UI) to be presented to a user via a client computer (700 of Fig. 7) so that information pertaining to the user's specific media can be collected from the user (702 of Fig. 7), if a logical ID is found that corresponds to the physical ID (608 of Fig. 6), using the logical ID to query one or more databases that contain metadata associated with the specific media (610 of Fig. 6), and returning metadata associated with the specific media to a client (610 of Fig. 6), wherein different instances of a specific media with the same content thereon are associated with different physical IDs that are mappable to the same logical ID (708, 710, 712 of Fig. 7).

Claim 19 recites a method of processing media content (Fig. 6) comprising: receiving a physical ID that corresponds to a specific media associated with content that can be experienced by a user (604 of Fig. 6), attempting to map the physical ID to a logical ID (606 of Fig. 6), if a logical ID is found that corresponds to the physical ID, searching a database that contains metadata associated with the specific media by using the logical ID as a basis for a search query (610 of Fig. 6), if no logical ID is found that corresponds to the physical ID, attempting to establish a logical ID for the physical ID by causing a user interface (UI) to be presented to a user via a client

computer (700 of Fig. 7) so that information pertaining to the user's specific media can be collected from the user (702 of Fig. 7), wherein different instances of a specific media with the same content thereon are associated with different physical IDs that are mappable to the same logical ID (708, 710, 712 of Fig. 7).

Claim 27 recites a server computer (106 of Fig. 1, 200 of Fig. 2) comprising: one or more processors (202 of Fig 2), one or more storage devices (108 of Fig. 1, 204, 228, 230, 234 of Fig. 2), and software code resident on the one or more storage devices (212, 214, 216, 218, and 220 of Fig. 2), which, when executed by the one or more processors (202 of Fig 2), cause the processors to: receive a physical ID that corresponds to a specific media upon which content resides that can be experienced by a user (604 of Fig. 6), attempt to map the physical ID to a logical ID (606, 608 of Fig 6), if a logical ID is found that corresponds to the physical ID (608 of Fig. 6), search a database that contains metadata associated with the specific media by using the logical ID as a basis for a search query (610 of Fig. 6, 1300 of Fig. 13), and if no logical ID is found that corresponds to the physical ID, attempt to establish a logical ID for the physical ID by causing a Wizard user interface (UI) to be presented to a user via a client computer (700 of Fig. 7) so that information pertaining to the user's specific media can be collected from the user (702 of Fig. 7), wherein different instances of a specific media with the same content thereon are associated with different physical IDs that are mappable to the same logical ID (708, 710, 712 of Fig. 7).

Claim 29 recites a method of processing media content (Fig. 6) comprising: receiving a physical ID that corresponds to a specific media upon which content resides that can be experienced by a user (604 of Fig. 6), attempting to map the physical ID to a logical ID by searching a first table containing physical ID-to-logical ID mappings using a first search (606 of Fig. 6), if the first search is unsuccessful, searching a second table containing physical ID-to-logical ID mappings using a second search (612 of Fig. 6), and if a logical ID is found that corresponds to the physical ID, searching a database that contains metadata associated with the specific media by using the logical ID as a basis for a search query (616 of Fig. 6), wherein different instances of a specific media with the same content thereon are associated with different physical IDs that are mappable to the same logical ID (708, 710, 712 of Fig. 7).

Claim 35 recites one or more computer-readable media having computer-readable instructions thereon (228, 232, 236 of Fig. 2) which, when executed by a computer (200 of Fig. 2), cause the computer (200 of Fig. 2) to: receive a physical ID that corresponds to a specific media upon which content resides that can be experienced by a user (604 of Fig. 6), attempt to map the physical ID to a logical ID by searching a first table containing physical ID-to-logical ID mappings using a first search, the first search comprising a low cost search (606 of Fig 6), if the first search is unsuccessful, search a second table containing physical ID-to-logical ID mappings using a second search (612 of Fig 6), if the second search is unsuccessful, search the

first table using a third search, the third search comprising a higher cost search than the first search (618 of Fig. 6), and if a logical ID is found that corresponds to the physical ID, search a database that contains metadata associated with the specific media by using the logical ID as a basis for a search query (608, 610 of Fig. 6), wherein different instances of a specific media with the same content thereon are associated with different physical IDs that are mappable to the same logical ID (708, 710, 712 of Fig. 7).

Claim 36 recites a method of processing media content comprising: providing a canonical table containing physical ID to logical ID mappings (600 of Fig. 6), the physical IDs being associated with specific media containing content that can be experienced by a user (Fig. 3), the logical IDs being configured for use in database queries to locate metadata associated with specific media (Fig. 3, 404, 406 of Fig. 4), providing a table containing user-provided physical ID to logical ID mappings (602 of Fig. 6), receiving a physical ID associated with a specific media (604 of Fig. 6), conducting a first low cost search of the canonical table to determine whether there is a matching physical ID with a corresponding logical ID (606 of Fig. 6), if the first low cost search is unsuccessful, conducting a second low cost search of the table containing the user-provided physical ID to logical ID mappings to determine whether there is a matching physical ID with a corresponding logical ID (612 of Fig. 6), if the second low cost search is unsuccessful, conducting a third higher cost search of the canonical table to determine whether there is a matching physical ID with a

corresponding logical ID (618 of Fig. 6), and if any of the searches are successful, using the corresponding logical ID to search a database containing metadata associated with the specific media (610, 616 of Fig. 6), wherein different instances of a specific media with the same content thereon are associated with different physical IDs that are mappable to the same logical ID (708, 710, 712 of Fig. 7).

Claim 39 recites a method of processing media content comprising: receiving a physical ID that corresponds to a specific media upon which content resides that can be experienced by a user (604 of Fig. 6), attempting to map the physical ID to a logical ID, the logical ID serving as a basis for a search query of a database that contains metadata associated with the specific media (606 of Fig. 6), if no logical ID is found that corresponds to the physical ID, attempting to establish a logical ID for the physical ID by causing a Wizard user interface (UI) to be presented to a user via a client computer (700 of Fig. 7) so that information pertaining to the user's specific media can be collected from the user (702 of Fig. 7), wherein different instances of a specific media with the same content thereon are associated with different physical IDs that are mappable to the same logical ID (708, 710, 712 of Fig. 7).

Claim 47 recites one or more computer-readable media having computer-readable instructions thereon (228, 232, 236 of Fig. 2) which, when executed by a computer (200 of Fig. 2), cause the computer (200 of Fig. 2) to: receive a physical ID that corresponds to a specific media upon which content resides that can be experienced by a user (604 of Fig. 6), attempt to map the physical ID to a logical ID

(606 of Fig. 6), the logical ID serving as a basis for a search query of a database that contains metadata associated with the specific media, if no logical ID is found that corresponds to the physical ID, attempt to establish a logical ID for the physical ID by causing a Wizard user interface (UI) to be presented to a user via a client computer (700 of Fig. 7) so that information pertaining to the user's specific media can be collected from the user (702 of Fig. 7), wherein different instances of a specific media with the same content thereon are associated with different physical IDs that are mappable to the same logical ID (708, 710, 712 of Fig. 7).

Claim 51 recites a system for providing metadata to clients comprising: a trusted canonical table comprising multiple physical IDs associated with specific media (500 of Fig. 5), containing content that can be experienced by a user, multiple logical IDs associated with the multiple physical IDs (500 of Fig. 5), individual physical IDs being mapped to individual logical IDs, at least one other less trusted table containing multiple physical IDs and multiple logical IDs (502 of Fig. 5), individual physical IDs being mapped to individual logical IDs, and the logical IDs being configured for use in database queries to locate metadata associated with specific media (Fig. 3), wherein different instances of a specific media with the same content thereon are associated with different physical IDs that are mappable to the same logical ID (708, 710, 712 of Fig. 7).

Claim 56 recites a method of processing media content comprising: receiving a physical ID that corresponds to a specific CD (604 of Fig. 6) upon which content

resides that can be experienced by a user, attempting to map the physical ID to a logical ID (606 of Fig. 6), if no logical ID is found that corresponds to the physical ID, attempting to establish a logical ID for the physical ID by causing a user interface (UI) to be presented to a user via a client computer (700 of Fig. 7) so that information pertaining to the user's specific media can be collected from the user (702 of Fig. 7), if a logical ID is found that corresponds to the physical ID, searching a database that contains metadata associated with the CD by using the logical ID as a basis for a search query (1300 of Fig. 13), formatting the metadata in a XML schema (1304 of Fig. 13), and returning the formatted metadata to a client (1306 of Fig. 13), wherein different instances of a specific CD with the same content thereon are associated with different physical IDs that are mappable to the same logical ID (708, 710, 712 of Fig. 7).

Claim 61 recites a method of processing media content comprising: receiving a physical ID that corresponds to a specific DVD (604 of Fig. 6) upon which content resides that can be experienced by a user, attempting to map the physical ID to a logical ID (606 of Fig. 6), if no logical ID is found that corresponds to the physical ID, attempting to establish a logical ID for the physical ID by causing a user interface (UI) to be presented to a user via a client computer (700 of Fig. 7) so that information pertaining to the user's specific media can be collected from the user (702 of Fig. 7), if a logical ID is found that corresponds to the physical ID, searching a database that contains metadata associated with the DVD by using the logical ID as a basis for a

search query (1300 of Fig. 13), formatting the metadata in a XML schema (1304 of Fig. 13), and returning the formatted metadata to a client (1306 of Fig. 13), wherein different instances of a specific DVD with the same content thereon are associated with different physical IDs that are mappable to the same logical ID (708, 710, 712 of Fig. 7).

Claim 69 recites a method of processing media content comprising: generating a physical ID that corresponds to a specific media (402 of Fig. 4) upon which content resides that can be experienced by a user on a client computer (100, 102 of Fig. 1), wherein different instances of the specific media with the same content thereon are associated with different physical IDs that are mappable to a same logical ID (404 of Fig. 4)), sending the physical ID to a server configured to return metadata associated with the specific media (402 of Fig. 4), attempting to map the physical ID to a logical ID (404 of Fig. 4), if no logical ID is found that corresponds to the physical ID, attempt to establish a logical ID for the physical ID by causing a user interface (UI) to be presented to a user via a client computer (408 of Fig. 4) so that information pertaining to the user's specific media can be collected from the user, if a logical ID is found that corresponds to the physical ID (410 of Fig. 4), searching a database that contains metadata associated with the specific media by using the logical ID as a basis for a search query (410 of Fig. 4), receiving, from the server, XML-formatted metadata (1400 of Fig. 14), parsing, with the client computer, the XML-formatted metadata (1402 of Fig. 14), and displaying the metadata for the user on the client

computer (1404 of Fig. 14).

Claim 72 recites a method of providing metadata to a client comprising: establishing a table that contains user-provided entries that map physical IDs to logical IDs (Fig. 3, 500, 502 of Fig. 5, 600 of Fig. 6), the physical IDs corresponding to specific media upon which content resides that can be experienced by various users, the logical IDs being configured for use in querying one or more databases that contain metadata associated with the specific media, the metadata being returnable to a client, statistically evaluating the entries to determine, for each physical ID, a most likely logical ID match (1600, 1602, 1604, 1606 of Fig. 16), and making the most likely logical ID match available so that it can be used to query the one or more databases (1608, 1610 of Fig. 16).

Claim 74 recites a method of providing metadata to a client comprising: providing a table containing user-provided entries that map physical IDs to logical IDs (Fig. 3, 500, 502 of Fig. 5, 600 of Fig. 6), the physical IDs corresponding to specific media upon which content resides that can be experienced by various users, the logical IDs being configured for use in querying one or more databases that contain metadata associated with the specific media, the metadata being returnable to a client, computing, from the table, a list of physical IDs that are to be statistically evaluated (1600 of Fig. 16), for each listed physical ID, ascertaining the logical IDs that have been associated with it by users (1602 of Fig. 16), computing a distribution of logical IDs for a given physical ID (1604 of Fig. 16), the distribution describing,

for each logical ID, the number of times the physical ID has been mapped thereto, adding to the distribution, an entry that corresponds to a current trusted logical ID mapping (1606 of Fig. 16), weighting the added entry (1608 of Fig. 16), and computing, from the distribution, a most likely physical ID to logical ID match (1610 of Fig. 16).

(6) Grounds of Rejection to be Reviewed on Appeal

Claims 1-19, 21-27, 39-47, 56-62 and 69-71 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being obvious over U.S. Patent Application No. 2001/0031066 to Meyer et al. (“Meyer”) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,549,922 to Srivastava et al. (“Srivastava”).

Claims 29-34 and 36-38 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being obvious over U.S. Patent No. 6,553,379 to Jaeger et al. (“Jaeger”) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,704,748 to Suganuma (“Suganuma”).

Claims 35, 51, and 55 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being obvious over Jaeger in view of Suganuma, and further in view of Srivastava.

Claims 72-76 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being obvious over U.S. Patent No. 6,345,257 to Milsted et al. (“Milsted”).

(7) Argument

Appellant submits that the Office failed to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness in rejecting: 1) Claims 1-19, 21-27, 39-47, 56-62 and 69-71 as being

obvious over Meyer in view of Srivastava, 2) Claims 29-34 and 36-38 as being obvious over Jaeger in view of Suganuma, 3) Claims 35, 51, and 55 as being obvious over Jaeger and Suganuma, in view of Srivastava, and 4) Claims 72-76 as being obvious over Milsted.

Before discussing the substance of the Office's rejections, however, a section entitled "The §103 Standard" is provided and will be used in addressing the Examiner's rejections. Next, a section entitled "Argument Overview" is provided to give the reader context for specific arguments that follow. Appellant then addresses the Office's grounds for rejecting the pending Claims.

The §103 Standard

To establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness, three criteria must be met. First, there must be some suggestion or motivation, either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art, to modify the reference or to combine reference teachings. *In re Jones*, 958 F.2d 347, 21 USPQ2d 1941 (Fed. Cir. 1992); *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 USPQ2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1998). Second, there must be a reasonable expectation of success. *In re Merck & Co., Inc.*, 800 F.2d 1091, 231 USPQ 375 (Fed. Cir. 1986). Finally, the prior art references (or references when combined) must teach or suggest all the claim limitations. *In re Royka*, 490 F.2d 981, 180 USPQ 580 (CCPA 1994).

Hence, when patentability turns on the question of obviousness, the search for and analysis of the prior art includes evidence relevant to the findings of whether there is a teaching, motivation, or suggestion to select and combine or modify the references relied on as evidence of obviousness. The need for specificity pervades this authority. See, e.g., *In re Kotzab*, 217 F.3d 1365, 1371, 55 USPQ2d 13413, 1317 (Fed. Cir. 2000) (“particular findings must be made as to the reason the skilled artisan, with no knowledge of the claimed invention, would have selected these components for combination in the manner claimed”).

Argument Overview

Regarding Claims 1, 8-10, 19, 27, 39, 47, 56, 61 and 69. Generally, Meyer teaches the linking of audio data, metadata, and actions via a communications network. The audio data are transformed into connected media objects via embedded identifiers. A decoding process extracts the identifier from the media object and forwards it to a server. The server maps the identifier to an action such as returning metadata, redirecting the request to another server, or requesting information from another server to identify the media object (Paragraph 0012).

In contrast, appealed independent Claims 1, 8-10, 19, 27, 39, 47, 56, 61 and 69 are concerned with processing media content by attempting to map the media’s physical identifier to its logical identifier. While mapping the logical identification to the physical identification, if the logical identification is not found, a computer

interface is presented so that the user can input information pertaining to the media content.

Applicant respectfully submits that Claims 1, 8-10, 19, 27, 39, 47, 56, 61 and 69, when read in light of the specification, define subject matter not taught or suggested by Meyer in view of Srivastava, or any combination thereof.

Regarding Claims 29 and 36. Generally, Jaeger teaches an address storage device for a vehicle. The address storage device is assigned to an application interface, each application interface communicates with the storage device and if required reads out at least parts of address data stored in the storage device. (Column 1, lines 34-65).

In contrast, appealed independent Claims 29 and 36 are concerned with processing media content by attempting to map the media's physical identifier to its logical identifier by searching a first table containing physical ID to logical ID mappings. If the search is unsuccessful, searching a second table containing physical ID to logical ID mappings. If the logical ID is found, then searching a database that contains metadata associated with the media using the logical ID, where specific media may be associated with different physical ID's that are mappable to the same logical ID.

Applicant respectfully submits that Claims 29 and 36, when read in light of the specification, define subject matter not taught or suggested by Jaeger in view of Sukanuma, or any combination thereof.

Regarding Claims 35 and 51. Appealed independent Claim 35 is concerned with computer readable media having computer readable instructions that when executed by a computer, causes the computer to receive a physical ID that corresponds to a specific media, attempt to map the physical ID to a logical ID by searching a first table and if the search is unsuccessful, searching a second table containing physical ID to logical ID mappings. If the second search is unsuccessful, searching the first table using a higher cost third search. If a logical ID is found that corresponds to the physical ID, then search a database that contains metadata associated with the specific media by using the logical ID.

Appealed independent Claim 51 is concerned with a system for providing metadata to a client computer. The system includes a trusted table containing multiple physical IDs associated with specific media, multiple logical ID's associated with the multiple physical IDs, at least one other less trusted table containing physical IDs and logical IDs. Where the logical IDs are configured to locate the metadata associated with the specific media.

Applicant respectfully submits that Claims 35 and 51, when read in light of the specification, define subject matter not taught or suggested by Jaeger in view of Suganuma, and further in view of Srivastava, or any combination thereof.

Regarding Claims 72 and 74. Generally, Milsted teaches a system for tracking usage of digital content on user devices. Online stores coupled to a computer

network sell licenses to play digital content. Content players receive the licensed content from the network and play the digital content. (Column 6, lines 34-48).

Appealed independent Claim 72 is concerned with providing metadata to a client by establishing a table that contains user provided entries that map physical IDs to logical IDs, the physical IDs corresponding to specific media and the logical IDs being configured for querying one or more databases. Statistically evaluating the entries to determine a most likely logical ID match for each physical ID and making the most likely logical ID match available for querying one or more databases.

Appealed independent Claim 74 is concerned with providing metadata to a client by providing a table containing user provided entries that map physical IDs to logical IDs, the physical IDs corresponding to specific media, and the logical IDs being configured to query one or more databases that contain metadata associated with specific media. Computing from the table, a list of physical ID that are to be statistically evaluated, for each physical ID, ascertaining the logical IDs that have been associated with the it by the users. Computing a distribution of logical IDs to a given physical ID. Then adding to the distribution an entry that corresponds to a trusted logical ID mapping, weighting the added entry, and computing from the distribution a most likely physical to logical ID match.

Applicant respectfully submits that Claims 72 and 74, when read in light of the specification, define subject matter not taught or suggested by Milsted.

Claims 1-19, 21-27, 39-47, 56-62 and 69-71

Regarding Independent Claims 1, 8-10, 19, 27, 39, 47, 56, 61 and 69

Appellant respectfully submits that the Office failed to establish a *prima facie* case of anticipation in rejecting Claims 1, 8-10, 19, 27, 39, 47, 56, 61 and 69. Specifically, the Office failed to establish that Myer and Srivastava, individually or in combination, teach or suggest all the Claim limitations.

For the reader's convenience, independent Claims 1, 8-10, 19, 27, 39, 47, 56, 61 and 69 have been provided below:

Claim 1 recites a method of processing media content comprising:

- receiving a physical ID that corresponds to a specific media upon which content resides that can be experienced by a user;
- attempting to map the physical ID to a logical ID;
- *if no logical ID is found that corresponds to the physical ID, attempting to establish a logical ID for the physical ID by causing a Wizard user interface (UI) to be presented to a user via a client computer so that information pertaining to the user's specific media can be collected from the user;* and
- if a logical ID is found that corresponds to the physical ID, searching a database that contains metadata associated with the specific media by using the logical ID as a basis for a search query, wherein different instances of a specific media with the same content thereon are associated with different physical IDs that are mappable to the same logical ID. (Emphasis added)

Claim 8 recites a server comprising:

- one or more processors;
- one or more storage devices; and
- software code resident on the one or more storage devices which, when executed by the one or more processors, cause the processors to:

- receive a physical ID that corresponds to a specific media upon which content resides that can be experienced by a user;
- attempt to map the physical ID to a logical ID;
- ***if no logical ID is found that corresponds to the physical ID, attempt to establish a logical ID for the physical ID by causing a Wizard user interface (UI) to be presented to a user via a client computer so that information pertaining to the user's specific media can be collected from the user;***
- if a logical ID is found that corresponds to the physical ID, search a database that contains metadata associated with the specific media by using the logical ID as a basis for a search query;
- format the metadata in a XML schema; and
- return the formatted metadata to a client, wherein different instances of a specific media with the same content thereon are associated with different physical IDs that are mappable to the same logical ID. (Emphasis added)

Claim 9 recites one or more computer-readable media having computer-readable instructions thereon which, when executed by a computer, cause the computer to:

- receive a physical ID that corresponds to a specific media upon which content resides that can be experienced by a user;
- attempt to map the physical ID to a logical ID;
- ***if no logical ID is found that corresponds to the physical ID, attempt to establish a logical ID for the physical ID by causing a user interface (UI) to be presented to a user via a client computer so that information pertaining to the user's specific media can be collected from the user;***
- if a logical ID is found that corresponds to the physical ID, search a database that contains metadata associated with the specific media by using the logical ID as a basis for a search query;
- format the metadata in a XML schema; and
- return the formatted metadata to a client, wherein different instances of a specific media with the same content thereon are associated with different physical IDs that are mappable to the same logical ID. (Emphasis added)

Claim 10 recites a method of processing media content comprising:

- attempting to map a physical ID to a logical ID, the physical ID corresponding to a specific media associated with content that can be experienced by a user;
- *if no logical ID is found that corresponds to the physical ID, attempting to establish a logical ID for the physical ID by causing a user interface (UI) to be presented to a user via a client computer so that information pertaining to the user's specific media can be collected from the user;*
- if a logical ID is found that corresponds to the physical ID, using the logical ID to query one or more databases that contain metadata associated with the specific media; and
- returning metadata associated with the specific media to a client, wherein different instances of a specific media with the same content thereon are associated with different physical IDs that are mappable to the same logical ID. (Emphasis added).

Claim 19 recites a method of processing media content comprising:

- receiving a physical ID that corresponds to a specific media associated with content that can be experienced by a user;
- attempting to map the physical ID to a logical ID;
- if a logical ID is found that corresponds to the physical ID, searching a database that contains metadata associated with the specific media by using the logical ID as a basis for a search query;
- *if no logical ID is found that corresponds to the physical ID, attempting to establish a logical ID for the physical ID by causing a user interface (UI) to be presented to a user via a client computer so that information pertaining to the user's specific media can be collected from the user,* wherein different instances of a specific media with the same content thereon are associated with different physical IDs that are mappable to the same logical ID. (Emphasis added).

Claim 27 recites a server computer comprising:

- one or more processors;
- one or more storage devices; and
- software code resident on the one or more storage devices which, when executed by the one or more processors, cause the processors to:

- receive a physical ID that corresponds to a specific media upon which content resides that can be experienced by a user;
- attempt to map the physical ID to a logical ID;
- if a logical ID is found that corresponds to the physical ID, search a database that contains metadata associated with the specific media by using the logical ID as a basis for a search query; and
- ***if no logical ID is found that corresponds to the physical ID, attempt to establish a logical ID for the physical ID by causing a Wizard user interface (UI) to be presented to a user via a client computer so that information pertaining to the user's specific media can be collected from the user,*** wherein different instances of a specific media with the same content thereon are associated with different physical IDs that are mappable to the same logical ID. (Emphasis added).

Claim 39 recites a method of processing media content comprising:

- receiving a physical ID that corresponds to a specific media upon which content resides that can be experienced by a user;
- attempting to map the physical ID to a logical ID, the logical ID serving as a basis for a search query of a database that contains metadata associated with the specific media;
- ***if no logical ID is found that corresponds to the physical ID, attempting to establish a logical ID for the physical ID by causing a Wizard user interface (UI) to be presented to a user via a client computer so that information pertaining to the user's specific media can be collected from the user,*** wherein different instances of a specific media with the same content thereon are associated with different physical IDs that are mappable to the same logical ID. (Emphasis added).

Claim 47 recites one or more computer-readable media having computer-readable instructions thereon which, when executed by a computer, cause the computer to:

- receive a physical ID that corresponds to a specific media upon which content resides that can be experienced by a user;

- attempt to map the physical ID to a logical ID, the logical ID serving as a basis for a search query of a database that contains metadata associated with the specific media;
- ***if no logical ID is found that corresponds to the physical ID, attempt to establish a logical ID for the physical ID by causing a Wizard user interface (UI) to be presented to a user via a client computer so that information pertaining to the user's specific media can be collected from the user,*** wherein different instances of a specific media with the same content thereon are associated with different physical IDs that are mappable to the same logical ID. (Emphasis added).

Claim 56 recites a method of processing media content comprising:

- receiving a physical ID that corresponds to a specific CD upon which content resides that can be experienced by a user;
- attempting to map the physical ID to a logical ID;
- ***if no logical ID is found that corresponds to the physical ID, attempting to establish a logical ID for the physical ID by causing a user interface (UI) to be presented to a user via a client computer so that information pertaining to the user's specific media can be collected from the user;***
- if a logical ID is found that corresponds to the physical ID, searching a database that contains metadata associated with the CD by using the logical ID as a basis for a search query;
- formatting the metadata in a XML schema; and
- returning the formatted metadata to a client, wherein different instances of a specific CD with the same content thereon are associated with different physical IDs that are mappable to the same logical ID. (Emphasis added).

Claim 61 recites a method of processing media content comprising:

- receiving a physical ID that corresponds to a specific DVD upon which content resides that can be experienced by a user;
- attempting to map the physical ID to a logical ID;
- ***if no logical ID is found that corresponds to the physical ID, attempting to establish a logical ID for the physical ID by causing a user interface (UI) to be presented to a user via a client computer so that information pertaining to the user's specific media can be collected from the user;***

- if a logical ID is found that corresponds to the physical ID, searching a database that contains metadata associated with the DVD by using the logical ID as a basis for a search query;
- formatting the metadata in a XML schema; and
- returning the formatted metadata to a client, wherein different instances of a specific DVD with the same content thereon are associated with different physical IDs that are mappable to the same logical ID. (Emphasis added).

Claim 69 recites a method of processing media content comprising:

- generating a physical ID that corresponds to a specific media upon which content resides that can be experienced by a user on a client computer, wherein different instances of the specific media with the same content thereon are associated with different physical IDs that are mappable to a same logical ID;
- sending the physical ID to a server configured to return metadata associated with the specific media;
- attempting to map the physical ID to a logical ID;
- ***if no logical ID is found that corresponds to the physical ID, attempt to establish a logical ID for the physical ID by causing a user interface (UI) to be presented to a user via a client computer so that information pertaining to the user's specific media can be collected from the user;***
- if a logical ID is found that corresponds to the physical ID, searching a database that contains metadata associated with the specific media by using the logical ID as a basis for a search query;
- receiving, from the server, XML-formatted metadata;
- parsing, with the client computer, the XML-formatted metadata; and
- displaying the metadata for the user on the client computer. (Emphasis added).

For the reader's convenience, the Office's argument that Claim 1 is unpatentable over Meyer in view of Srivastava is provided below:

Regarding claim 1, Meyer discloses a method of processing media content comprising:

- a) receiving a physical ID that corresponds to a specific media upon which content resides that can be experienced by a user; (See Meyer paragraph 07, lines 4-8) Meyer and Srivastava disclose mapping a physical ID to a logical ID.
- b) attempting to map the physical ID to a logical ID; (See Meyer paragraph 018, lines 5-11; paragraph 019, lines 1-5) and (see Srivastava col. 8, lines 37-41; col. 8, lines 49-52; database mapping)
- c) if no logical ID is found that corresponds to the physical ID, attempting to establish a logical ID for the physical ID by causing a Wizard user interface (UI) to be presented to a user via a client computer so that information pertaining to the user's specific media can be collected from the user; (see Meyer paragraph 07, lines 12-15; paragraph 031, lines 12-16; paragraph 0031, lines 1-20: user interface for media information request/response procedure with server, registration of an ID and associating metadata with ID) and
- d) if a logical ID is found that corresponds to the physical ID, searching a database that contains metadata associated with the specific media by using the logical ID as a basis for a search query, wherein different instances of a specific media with the same content thereon are associated with different physical IDs that are mappable to the same logical ID. (see Meyer paragraph 07, lines 12-15; paragraph 078, lines 1-6; paragraph 018, lines 5-11; paragraph 019, lines 1-5) and (see Srivastava col. 8, lines 37-41; col. 8, lines 49-52: data mapping)

Office Action, pages 14 and 15.

The portions of Meyer relied on by the Office to reject Claim 1 are:

In the event that a media object is not linked, the decoding and server processes can be programmed to enable the user to purchase a link for the object. For example in one scenario, the player plug-in displays a graphic for a link information indicating that the link is available after determining that an OID is not in the file. If the user clicks on the graphic, the plug-in displays more information about the procedure for ***purchasing or renting a link***. This information may be provided in conjunction with querying the server and displaying information returned from the server, or alternatively, providing pre-programmed information incorporated into the plug-in. ***If the user is***

interested in purchasing the link, he or she can then enter input (e.g., click on a button such as "Get Link") that initiates the process of registering an OID with the object and associating metadata or actions with the OID. The process of registering the OID and associating the OID with metadata or actions may be performed as described in this document. This scenario provides yet another mechanism for transforming content into connected content. (Emphasis added).

Meyer at paragraph 031, lines 1-20

Based on the cited sections of Meyer, the Office argues that “Meyer discloses a registration process wherein an identifier (*i.e.*, a logical identifier) is linked with a database record, which associates the identifier with data.” (Office Action page 15). Whether or not Meyer teaches or suggests the particular registration process as the Office alleges, Meyer nonetheless fails to teach or suggest the above-mentioned feature of the Claims under discussion.

As highlighted in the excerpt above, Meyer gives a user the option of “purchasing or renting a link” and, to do so, a user can “enter input (e.g., click on a button...).” Nowhere in this section or elsewhere does Meyer disclose or suggest attempt[ing] to establish a logical ID for the physical ID *by causing a Wizard user interface (UI) to be presented to a user via a client computer so that information pertaining to the user’s specific media can be collected from the user.* Meyer simply gives a user the option of purchasing or renting a link, but does not collect “*information pertaining to the user’s specific media*” from the user, as recited in

Applicant's Claims. (Emphasis added) This feature is clearly missing from the cited references.

Accordingly, Applicant submits that the Office has failed to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness with respect to Claims 1, 8-10, 19, 27, 39, 47, 56, 61 and 69 for at least the reason that the cited references clearly fail to teach or suggest all of these Claims' recited features.

Claims 2-4, 11-18, 21-26, 40-46, 57-60, 62, and 70-71 depend from one of independent Claims 1, 10, 19, 39, 56, 61, and 69 and are allowable as depending from an allowable base claim. These claims are also allowable for their own recited features that, in combination with those recited in Claims 1, 10, 19, 39, 56, 61, and 69, have not been shown to be anticipated in the Final Office Action.

Claims 29-34 and 36-38

Claims 29-34 and 36-38 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being obvious over Jaeger in view of Suganuma.

Regarding Independent Claims 29 and 36

Appellant respectfully submits that the Office failed to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness in rejecting Claims 29 and 36 in the Office Action. Specifically, the Office failed to establish that Jaeger and Suganuma teach or suggest every element of Claims 29 and 36.

For the reader's convenience, Appellant sets forth the language of independent Claims 29 and 36.

Claim 29 recites a method of processing media content comprising:

- receiving a physical ID that corresponds to a specific media upon which content resides that can be experienced by a user;
- attempting to map the physical ID to a logical ID by searching a first table containing physical ID-to-logical ID mappings using a first search;
- if the first search is unsuccessful, searching a second table containing physical ID-to-logical ID mappings using a second search; and
- if a logical ID is found that corresponds to the physical ID, searching a database that contains metadata associated with the specific media by using the logical ID as a basis for a search query, ***wherein different instances of a specific media with the same content thereon are associated with different physical IDs that are mappable to the same logical ID.*** (Emphasis added)

Claim 36 recites a method of processing media content comprising:

- providing a canonical table containing physical ID to logical ID mappings, the physical IDs being associated with specific media containing content that can be experienced by a user, the logical IDs being configured for use in database queries to locate metadata associated with specific media;
- providing a table containing user-provided physical ID to logical ID mappings;
- receiving a physical ID associated with a specific media;
- conducting a first low cost search of the canonical table to determine whether there is a matching physical ID with a corresponding logical ID;
- if the first low cost search is unsuccessful, conducting a second low cost search of the table containing the user-provided physical ID to logical ID mappings to determine whether there is a matching physical ID with a corresponding logical ID;
- ***if the second low cost search is unsuccessful, conducting a third higher cost search of the canonical table to determine whether there is a matching physical ID with a corresponding logical ID;*** and
- if any of the searches are successful, using the corresponding logical ID to search a database containing metadata associated with the specific media, wherein different instances of a specific media with the same content thereon are associated with different physical IDs that are mappable to the same logical ID. (Emphasis added).

For the reader's convenience, the Office's argument that Jaeger and Suganuma teaches the highlighted element of Claim 29 is presented below:

[I]f a logical ID is found that corresponds to the physical ID, searching a database that contains metadata associated with the specific media by using the logical ID as a basis for a search query. (See Jaeger col. 4, lines 33-46; col 4, lines 50-56; search a physical ID logical ID table, second table)

Office Action, pages 40-41

The Office argues that the subject matter of Claim 29 is obvious over Jaeger in view of Suganuma. Applicant respectfully disagrees and submits that the Office has failed to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness for at least the reason that the cited combination of references fails to disclose or suggest all of this claim's recited features.

Specifically, the Office has failed to present any argument as to how the references teach or suggest “***wherein different instances of a specific media with the same content thereon are associated with different physical IDs that are mappable to the same logical ID,***” as recited in Claim 29. (Emphasis added). This feature is simply not addressed in the Office's rejections or in the cited portions of the references.

Accordingly, Applicant submits that the Office has failed to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness with respect to Claim 29 for at least the reason that the

Office has failed to establish (or even address) how the cited combination of references teaches or suggests all of the recited features of Claim 29.

Claims 30-34 depend from Claim 29 and are allowable as depending from an allowable base claim. These claims are also allowable for their own recited features that, in combination with those recited in Claim 29 have not been shown to be anticipated in the Final Office Action.

For the reader's convenience, the Office's argument that Jaeger and Suganuma discloses the highlighted element of Claim 36 is presented below:

[I]f the second low cost search is unsuccessful, conducting a third higher cost search of the canonical table to determine whether there is a matching physical ID with a corresponding logical ID; and if any of the searches are successful, using the corresponding logical ID to search a database containing metadata associated with the specific media, wherein different instances of a specific media with the same content thereon are associated with different physical IDs that are mappable to the same logical ID. (See Jaeger col. 4, lines 33-46; col 4, lines 50-56: search a physical ID logical ID table, first table).

Referring to claim 36, claim 36 encompasses the same scope of the invention as that of claim 29. Therefore, claim 36 is rejected for the same reason and motivation as claim 29.

Office Action, pages 44-45

The Office argues that the combination of Jaeger and Suganuma discloses all of the recited features of Claim 36. Applicant specifically points out that neither reference teaches or suggests “if the second search is unsuccessful, ***conducting a***

third higher cost search of the canonical table to determine whether there is a matching physical ID with a corresponding logical ID.” (Emphasis added).

The Office cites to Jaeger column 4, lines 33-46 and 50-56 as allegedly teaching this feature. However, this section of Jaeger merely discloses certain data structures and the particular data contained in those structures. Jaeger further discloses that the data records are assigned physical addresses of IDs that indicate where the records may be found. (Jaeger at column 4, lines 44-46). Jaeger does not teach or suggest a ***third higher cost search***, much less a third search comprising a ***higher cost*** than a first low cost search. (Emphasis added). This feature is clearly missing from Jaeger. Moreover, Suganuma fails to cure the deficiency of Jaeger.

Accordingly, Applicant submits that the Office has failed to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness with respect to Claim 36 for at least the reason that the Office has failed to establish how the cited references teach or suggest all of the recited features of Claim 36.

Claims 37 and 38 depend from Claim 36 and are allowable as depending from an allowable base claim. These claims are also allowable for their own recited features that, in combination with those recited in Claim 36 have not been shown to be anticipated in the Final Office Action.

Claims 35, 51, and 55

Claims 35, 51, and 55 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being obvious over Jaeger, in view of Suganuma, and in further view of Srivastava.

Appellant respectfully submits that the Office failed to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness in rejecting Claims 35 and 51. Specifically, the Office has failed to establish that Jaeger and Suganuma teach or suggest every element of Claims 35 and 51.

For the reader's convenience, Appellant sets forth the language of independent Claims 35 and 51.

Claim 35 recites one or more computer-readable media having computer-readable instructions thereon which, when executed by a computer, cause the computer to:

- receive a physical ID that corresponds to a specific media upon which content resides that can be experienced by a user;
- attempt to map the physical ID to a logical ID by searching a first table containing physical ID-to-logical ID mappings using a first search, the first search comprising a low cost search;
- if the first search is unsuccessful, search a second table containing physical ID-to-logical ID mappings using a second search;
- ***if the second search is unsuccessful, search the first table using a third search, the third search comprising a higher cost search than the first search;*** and
- if a logical ID is found that corresponds to the physical ID, search a database that contains metadata associated with the specific media by using the logical ID as a basis for a search query, wherein different instances of a specific media with the same content thereon are associated with different physical IDs that are mappable to the same logical ID. (Emphasis added).

Claim 51 recites a system for providing metadata to clients comprising:

- a trusted canonical table comprising multiple physical IDs associated with

- specific media containing content that can be experienced by a user;
- multiple logical IDs associated with the multiple physical IDs;
- individual physical IDs being mapped to individual logical IDs;
- ***at least one other less trusted table containing multiple physical IDs and multiple logical IDs, individual physical IDs being mapped to individual logical IDs***; and
- the logical IDs being configured for use in database queries to locate metadata associated with specific media, wherein different instances of a specific media with the same content thereon are associated with different physical IDs that are mappable to the same logical ID. (Emphasis added).

For the reader's convenience, the Office's argument that Jaeger and Suganuma discloses the highlighted element of Claim 35 is presented below:

[I]f the second search is unsuccessful, search the first table using a third search, the third search comprising a higher cost search than the first search; and
 if a logical ID is found that corresponds to the physical ID, search a database that contains metadata associated with the specific media by using the logical ID as a basis for a search query, wherein different instances of a specific media with the same content thereon are associated with different physical IDs that are mappable to the same logical ID. (see Jaeger col. 4, lines 33-46; col. 4, lines 50-56: search a physical ID-logical ID table, first table) and (see Suganuma col. 3, lines 1-6: identifier; col. 1, lines 66 – col. 2, line 7; col. 5, lines 10-13; col. 6, lines 41-44; col.6, lines 45-48) and (see Srivastava col. 8, lines 37-41; col. 8, lines 49-52: database mapping)

It would have been obvious ... to combine Jaeger's teachings of describing table name and its columns/rows as taught in Jaeger, and to enable the usage of search tables to *search a database management system as taught by Suganuma*, and to enable the capability to perform data base mapping of identifier (i.e., identification information) as taught by Srivastava.

Office Action, pages 46-47

The Office argues that the combination of Jaeger, Suganuma and Srivastava discloses all of the recited features of Claim 35. However, as discussed above with respect to Claim 36, Jaeger fails to teach or suggest “if the second search is unsuccessful, search the first table using a third search, ***the third search comprising a higher cost search than the first search.***” (Emphasis added). These features are simply missing from the cited references. The cited references either individually or in combination, fail to disclose or suggest all of Claim 35 recited features. Moreover, Suganuma and Srivastava fail to cure the deficiency of Jaeger.

Accordingly, Applicant submits that the Office has failed to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness with respect to Claim 35 for at least the reason that the Office has failed to establish how the cited references teach or suggest all of Claim 35 recited features.

For the reader’s convenience, the Office’s argument that Jaeger and Suganuma discloses the highlighted element of Claim 51 is presented below:

[A]t least one other less trusted table containing multiple physical IDs and multiple logical IDs, individual physical IDs being mapped to individual logical IDs; (see Jaeger col. 4, lines 33-46; col. 4, lines 50-56: physical IDs mapped to logical IDs table)

Office Action, pages 48

The sections of Jaeger cited by the Office are excerpted below:

With reference to FIG. 3, the structure of the data and lists will be described below. In FIG. 3a the structure of an address data record is shown. Such an address data record comprises all necessary address

data, for example name, prename, title, street, building number, zip code, city, telephone, fax, e-mail, internet, country, birthday and notes. Of course an address data record could comprise further information for example company name, position etc. A plurality of such address data records is stored at determined physical addresses in the storage means 12. These addresses (pointers) are indicated in a list, which is shown in FIG. 3b. Each address data record is signed to a physical address or identification number (ID) on the basis of which the respective address can be found in the list shown in FIG. 3b.

As already mentioned, the interface 14 operates with logical addresses which is the reason for keeping an assignment list (mapping list) between logical addresses and physical addresses. This list is shown in FIG. 3c. In this logical address management list each physical address and ID, respectively, is assigned to a logical address and ID, respectively, which for example are used when arranging subsets. For each assignment/mapping of a physical ID to a logical ID an index about the use of an address by single selectable operation menus is kept. The use is determined by a bitwise addressing and is for data consistency.

Jaeger, at column 4, lines 33-57.

Applicant submits that the cited sections of Jaeger, as well as Jaeger as a whole, fails to teach or suggest “a ***less trusted table*** containing multiple physical Ids and multiple logical IDs”, , as recited in Claim 51. Accordingly, and for at least this reason, the Office has failed to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness with respect to Claim 51.

Claim 55 depends from Claim 51 and is allowable as depending from an allowable base claim. This claim is also allowable for its own recited features which, in combination with those recited in Claim 51, are neither disclosed nor suggested in the references cited and applied by the Office.

Claims 72-76

Claims 72-76 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being obvious over Milsted.

Appellant respectfully submits that the Office failed to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness in rejecting Claims 72 and 74. Specifically, the Office failed to establish that Milsted teaches or suggests every element of Claims 72 and 74.

For the reader's convenience, Appellant sets forth the language of independent Claims 72 and 74.

Claim 72 recites a method of providing metadata to a client comprising:

- establishing a table that contains user-provided entries that map physical IDs to logical IDs, the physical IDs corresponding to specific media upon which content resides that can be experienced by various users, the logical IDs being configured for use in querying one or more databases that contain metadata associated with the specific media, the metadata being returnable to a client;
- *statistically evaluating the entries to determine, for each physical ID, a most likely logical ID match;* and
- making the most likely logical ID match available so that it can be used to query the one or more databases. (Emphasis added)

Claim 74 recites a method of providing metadata to a client comprising:

- *providing a table containing user-provided entries that map physical IDs to logical IDs,* the physical IDs corresponding to specific media upon which content resides that can be experienced by various users, the logical IDs being configured for use in querying one or more databases that contain metadata associated with the specific media, the metadata being returnable to a client;
- computing, from the table, a list of physical IDs that are to be statistically evaluated;
- for each listed physical ID, ascertaining the logical IDs that have been

- associated with it by users;
- ***computing a distribution of logical IDs for a given physical ID, the distribution describing, for each logical ID, the number of times the physical ID has been mapped thereto;***
- ***adding to the distribution, an entry that corresponds to a current trusted logical ID mapping;***
- ***weighting the added entry; and***
- ***computing, from the distribution, a most likely physical ID to logical ID match.*** (Emphasis added)

In making out the rejection of Claim 72, the Office argues that Claim 72's subject matter is obvious over Milsted. Applicant respectfully disagrees and submits that the Office has failed to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness for at least the reason that Milsted fails to teach or suggest all of the recited features of Claim 72.

For the reader's convenience, portions of the Office's argument that Milsted discloses the highlighted element of Claim 72 is presented below:

It is an object of the present invention to remove the above-mentioned drawbacks and to provide a system for tracking usage of content data. One embodiment of the present invention provides a system for tracking usage of digital content on user devices. (Column 6, lines 34-38).

Additionally, a logging site that is coupled to the network tracks the playing of the content data. In particular, the logging site receives play information from the network, and the play information includes the number of times that the content data has been played by the associated content player. (Column 6, lines 42-47).

The Clearinghouse(s) 105 maintains a Audit Logs 150 of information for each operation that is performed during Content 113 purchase transactions and report request transactions. The information can be used for a variety of purposes such as audits of the Secure Digital Content Electronic Distribution System 100, generation of reports, and data mining. (Column 47, lines 47-53).

Applicant submits that nowhere in these sections does Milsted teach or suggest subject matter that even remotely resembles the subject matter recited by Claim 72. Specifically, Milsted fails to mention either a ***logical ID*** or a ***physical ID***, much less a ***statistical evaluation of entries*** to determine, for each physical ID, a most likely logical ID match. (Emphasis added). The subject matter of Claim 72 is simply absent from the disclosure of Milsted.

Accordingly, and at least for these reasons, the Office has failed to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness with respect to Claim 72.

Claim 73 depends from Claim 72 and is allowable as depending from an allowable base claim. This claim is also allowable for its own recited features which, in combination with those recited in claim 72, are neither disclosed nor suggested in the references cited and applied by the Office.

In making out the rejection of Claim 74, the Office argues that its subject matter is obvious over Milsted. Applicant respectfully disagrees and submits that the Office has failed to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness since Milsted fails to disclose or suggest all of Claim 74's recited features.

The sections cited by the Office as disclosing the subject matter of Claim 74 are the same sections cited against Claim 72. Accordingly, the reader is directed to the sections that discuss the rejection of Claim 72.

A review of the cited sections, and in point of fact the entirety of Milsted, reveals that Milsted in no way teaches or suggests the subject matter of the present Claim. Milsted fails to make any mention of *a physical ID to logical ID mapping*, much less the feature of *computing a distribution of logical IDs for a given physical ID, the distribution describing, for each logical ID, the number of times the physical ID has been mapped thereto*. (Emphasis added).

Further, since Milsted fails to teach or suggest the computation of a distribution of logical IDs for a given physical ID, it would be impossible for Milsted to further teach or suggest the claim features that logically depend from the computation of said distribution. The features of this claim are simply absent from Milsted.

Accordingly, and for at least the reasons discussed above, the Office has failed to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness with respect to Claim 74.

Claims 75-76 depend from Claim 74 and are allowable as depending from an allowable base Claim. These Claims are also allowable for their own recited features which, in combination with those recited in Claim 74, are neither disclosed nor suggested in the references cited and applied by the Office.

Conclusion

Appellant respectfully submits that all of the Examiner's rejections have been traversed. As such, Appellant respectfully submits that all of the Claims are in condition for allowance.

Respectfully Submitted,

Dated: 25 February 2008

By: /Jeffrey Valley/
Jeffrey Valley
Lee & Hayes, PLLC
Reg. No. 50,563
(509) 324-9256 x262

(8) Appendix of Appealed Claims

1. **(Previously Presented)** A method of processing media content comprising:

receiving a physical ID that corresponds to a specific media upon which content resides that can be experienced by a user;

attempting to map the physical ID to a logical ID;

if no logical ID is found that corresponds to the physical ID, attempting to establish a logical ID for the physical ID by causing a Wizard user interface (UI) to be presented to a user via a client computer so that information pertaining to the user's specific media can be collected from the user; and

if a logical ID is found that corresponds to the physical ID, searching a database that contains metadata associated with the specific media by using the logical ID as a basis for a search query, wherein different instances of a specific media with the same content thereon are associated with different physical IDs that are mappable to the same logical ID.

2. **(Original)** The method of claim 1 further comprising returning the metadata to a client.

3. **(Original)** The method of claim 1 further comprising formatting the metadata in a schema and returning the formatted metadata to a client.

4. **(Original)** The method of claim 1 further comprising formatting the metadata in a XML schema and returning the formatted metadata to a client.

5. **(Original)** The method of claim 1, wherein the specific media comprises a CD.

6. **(Original)** The method of claim 1, wherein the specific media comprises a DVD.

7. **(Original)** One or more computer-readable media having computer-readable instructions thereon which, when executed by a computer, cause the computer to implement the method of claim 1.

8. **(Previously Presented)** A server comprising:

one or more processors;

one or more storage devices; and

software code resident on the one or more storage devices which, when executed by the one or more processors, cause the processors to:

receive a physical ID that corresponds to a specific media upon which content resides that can be experienced by a user;

attempt to map the physical ID to a logical ID;

if no logical ID is found that corresponds to the physical ID, attempt to establish a logical ID for the physical ID by causing a Wizard user interface (UI) to be presented to a user via a client computer so that information pertaining to the user's specific media can be collected from the user;

if a logical ID is found that corresponds to the physical ID, search a database that contains metadata associated with the specific media by using the logical ID as a basis for a search query;

format the metadata in a XML schema; and

return the formatted metadata to a client, wherein different instances of a specific media with the same content thereon are associated with different physical IDs that are mappable to the same logical ID.

9. **(Previously Presented)** One or more computer-readable media having computer-readable instructions thereon which, when executed by a computer, cause the computer to:

receive a physical ID that corresponds to a specific media upon which content resides that can be experienced by a user;

attempt to map the physical ID to a logical ID;

if no logical ID is found that corresponds to the physical ID, attempt to establish a logical ID for the physical ID by causing a user interface (UI) to be

presented to a user via a client computer so that information pertaining to the user's specific media can be collected from the user;

if a logical ID is found that corresponds to the physical ID, search a database that contains metadata associated with the specific media by using the logical ID as a basis for a search query;

format the metadata in a XML schema; and

return the formatted metadata to a client, wherein different instances of a specific media with the same content thereon are associated with different physical IDs that are mappable to the same logical ID.

10. **(Previously Presented)** A method of processing media content comprising:

attempting to map a physical ID to a logical ID, the physical ID corresponding to a specific media associated with content that can be experienced by a user;

if no logical ID is found that corresponds to the physical ID, attempting to establish a logical ID for the physical ID by causing a user interface (UI) to be presented to a user via a client computer so that information pertaining to the user's specific media can be collected from the user;

if a logical ID is found that corresponds to the physical ID, using the logical ID to query one or more databases that contain metadata associated with the specific media; and

returning metadata associated with the specific media to a client, wherein different instances of a specific media with the same content thereon are associated with different physical IDs that are mappable to the same logical ID.

11. **(Original)** The method of claim 10, wherein said returning comprises returning the metadata via the Internet.

12. **(Original)** The method of claim 10, wherein said returning comprises formatting the metadata in a schema and returning the formatted metadata to the client.

13. **(Original)** The method of claim 10, wherein said returning comprises formatting the metadata in a XML schema and returning the formatted metadata to the client.

14. **(Original)** The method of claim 10, wherein the specific media comprises a CD.

15. **(Original)** The method of claim 10, wherein the specific media comprises a DVD.

16. **(Original)** The method of claim 10, wherein the specific media comprises a file.

17. **(Original)** One or more computer-readable media having computer-readable instructions thereon which, when executed by a computer, cause the computer to implement the method of claim 10.

18. **(Original)** A server computer programmed with instructions which, when executed by the server computer, cause it to implement the method of claim 10.

19. **(Previously Presented)** A method of processing media content comprising:

receiving a physical ID that corresponds to a specific media associated with content that can be experienced by a user;

attempting to map the physical ID to a logical ID;

if a logical ID is found that corresponds to the physical ID, searching a database that contains metadata associated with the specific media by using the logical ID as a basis for a search query;

if no logical ID is found that corresponds to the physical ID, attempting to establish a logical ID for the physical ID by causing a user interface (UI) to be presented to a user via a client computer so that information pertaining to the user's

specific media can be collected from the user, wherein different instances of a specific media with the same content thereon are associated with different physical IDs that are mappable to the same logical ID.

20. **(Cancelled)**

21. **(Original)** The method of claim 19, wherein said attempting comprises attempting to identify the specific media to ascertain whether a logical ID already exists for the specific media.

22. **(Original)** The method of claim 19 further comprising if said attempting is unsuccessful, enabling the user to establish a physical ID-to-logical ID mapping for their physical ID.

23. **(Original)** The method of claim 19, wherein said specific media comprises a CD.

24. **(Original)** The method of claim 19, wherein said specific media comprises a DVD.

25. **(Original)** The method of claim 19, wherein said specific media

comprises a file.

26. **(Original)** One or more computer-readable media having computer-readable instructions thereon which, when executed by a computer, cause the computer to implement the method of claim 19.

27. **(Previously Presented)** A server computer comprising:

- one or more processors;
- one or more storage devices; and
- software code resident on the one or more storage devices which, when executed by the one or more processors, cause the processors to:
 - receive a physical ID that corresponds to a specific media upon which content resides that can be experienced by a user;
 - attempt to map the physical ID to a logical ID;
 - if a logical ID is found that corresponds to the physical ID, search a database that contains metadata associated with the specific media by using the logical ID as a basis for a search query; and
 - if no logical ID is found that corresponds to the physical ID, attempt to establish a logical ID for the physical ID by causing a Wizard user interface (UI) to be presented to a user via a client computer so that information pertaining to the user's specific media can be collected from the user, wherein

different instances of a specific media with the same content thereon are associated with different physical IDs that are mappable to the same logical ID.

28. **(Cancelled)**

29. **(Previously Presented)** A method of processing media content comprising:

receiving a physical ID that corresponds to a specific media upon which content resides that can be experienced by a user;

attempting to map the physical ID to a logical ID by searching a first table containing physical ID-to-logical ID mappings using a first search;

if the first search is unsuccessful, searching a second table containing physical ID-to-logical ID mappings using a second search; and

if a logical ID is found that corresponds to the physical ID, searching a database that contains metadata associated with the specific media by using the logical ID as a basis for a search query, wherein different instances of a specific media with the same content thereon are associated with different physical IDs that are mappable to the same logical ID.

30. **(Original)** The method of claim 29, wherein the first table is a trusted table.

31. **(Original)** The method of claim 29, wherein the first table is a trusted table and the second table is less trusted than the first table.

32. **(Original)** The method of claim 29, wherein the second table contains user-provided physical ID-to-logical ID mappings.

33. **(Original)** The method of claim 29, wherein the first search comprises a low cost search, and further comprising if no logical ID is found for the physical ID, searching the first table using a third search, the third search comprising a higher cost search than the first search.

34. **(Original)** One or more computer-readable media having computer-readable instructions thereon which, when executed by a computer, cause the computer to implement the method of claim 29.

35. **(Previously Presented)** One or more computer-readable media having computer-readable instructions thereon which, when executed by a computer, cause the computer to:

receive a physical ID that corresponds to a specific media upon which content resides that can be experienced by a user;

attempt to map the physical ID to a logical ID by searching a first table containing physical ID-to-logical ID mappings using a first search, the first search comprising a low cost search;

if the first search is unsuccessful, search a second table containing physical ID-to-logical ID mappings using a second search;

if the second search is unsuccessful, search the first table using a third search, the third search comprising a higher cost search than the first search; and

if a logical ID is found that corresponds to the physical ID, search a database that contains metadata associated with the specific media by using the logical ID as a basis for a search query, wherein different instances of a specific media with the same content thereon are associated with different physical IDs that are mappable to the same logical ID.

36. **(Previously Presented)** A method of processing media content comprising:

providing a canonical table containing physical ID to logical ID mappings, the physical IDs being associated with specific media containing content that can be experienced by a user, the logical IDs being configured for use in database queries to locate metadata associated with specific media;

providing a table containing user-provided physical ID to logical ID mappings;

receiving a physical ID associated with a specific media;

conducting a first low cost search of the canonical table to determine whether there is a matching physical ID with a corresponding logical ID;

if the first low cost search is unsuccessful, conducting a second low cost search of the table containing the user-provided physical ID to logical ID mappings to determine whether there is a matching physical ID with a corresponding logical ID;

if the second low cost search is unsuccessful, conducting a third higher cost search of the canonical table to determine whether there is a matching physical ID with a corresponding logical ID; and

if any of the searches are successful, using the corresponding logical ID to search a database containing metadata associated with the specific media, wherein different instances of a specific media with the same content thereon are associated with different physical IDs that are mappable to the same logical ID.

37. **(Original)** The method of claim 36, wherein the specific media comprises CDs.

38. **(Original)** The method of claim 36, wherein the specific media comprises DVDs.

39. **(Previously Presented)** A method of processing media content comprising:

receiving a physical ID that corresponds to a specific media upon which content resides that can be experienced by a user;

attempting to map the physical ID to a logical ID, the logical ID serving as a basis for a search query of a database that contains metadata associated with the specific media;

if no logical ID is found that corresponds to the physical ID, attempting to establish a logical ID for the physical ID by causing a Wizard user interface (UI) to be presented to a user via a client computer so that information pertaining to the user's specific media can be collected from the user, wherein different instances of a specific media with the same content thereon are associated with different physical IDs that are mappable to the same logical ID.

40. **(Original)** The method of claim 39 further comprising receiving information from the user, via the Wizard UI, the information pertaining to the user's specific media.

41. **(Original)** The method of claim 39, wherein the specific media comprises a CD, and the information collected by the Wizard UI comprises an artist's name.

42. **(Original)** The method of claim 39, wherein the specific media

comprises a CD, and the information collected by the Wizard UI comprises a CD title.

43. **(Original)** The method of claim 39, wherein the specific media comprises a DVD.

44. **(Original)** The method of claim 39 further comprising searching for specific media based on the information collected by the Wizard UI.

45. **(Original)** The method of claim 44 further comprising forming an association between the received physical ID and a logical ID if said searching finds media that coincides with the user's information.

46. **(Original)** The method of claim 44 further comprising if said searching is unsuccessful, prompting the user to enter media-specific information so that an association can be established between the media and a logical ID.

47. **(Previously Presented)** One or more computer-readable media having computer-readable instructions thereon which, when executed by a computer, cause the computer to:

receive a physical ID that corresponds to a specific media upon which content resides that can be experienced by a user;

attempt to map the physical ID to a logical ID, the logical ID serving as a basis for a search query of a database that contains metadata associated with the specific media;

if no logical ID is found that corresponds to the physical ID, attempt to establish a logical ID for the physical ID by causing a Wizard user interface (UI) to be presented to a user via a client computer so that information pertaining to the user's specific media can be collected from the user, wherein different instances of a specific media with the same content thereon are associated with different physical IDs that are mappable to the same logical ID.

48-50. **(Cancelled)**

51. **(Previously Presented)** A system for providing metadata to clients comprising:

a trusted canonical table comprising multiple physical IDs associated with specific media containing content that can be experienced by a user;

multiple logical IDs associated with the multiple physical IDs;

individual physical IDs being mapped to individual logical IDs;

at least one other less trusted table containing multiple physical IDs and multiple logical IDs, individual physical IDs being mapped to individual logical IDs;
and

the logical IDs being configured for use in database queries to locate metadata associated with specific media, wherein different instances of a specific media with the same content thereon are associated with different physical IDs that are mappable to the same logical ID.

52-54. **(Cancelled)**

55. **(Previously Presented)** The system of claim 51, wherein the at least one other less trusted table comprises user-provided mappings.

56. **(Previously Presented)** A method of processing media content comprising:

receiving a physical ID that corresponds to a specific CD upon which content resides that can be experienced by a user;

attempting to map the physical ID to a logical ID;

if no logical ID is found that corresponds to the physical ID, attempting to establish a logical ID for the physical ID by causing a user interface (UI) to be presented to a user via a client computer so that information pertaining to the user's specific media can be collected from the user;

if a logical ID is found that corresponds to the physical ID, searching a database that contains metadata associated with the CD by using the logical ID as a

basis for a search query;

formatting the metadata in a XML schema; and

returning the formatted metadata to a client, wherein different instances of a specific CD with the same content thereon are associated with different physical IDs that are mappable to the same logical ID.

57. **(Original)** The method of claim 56, wherein the XML schema comprises tags associated with one or more of: a CD name, author, release date, genre, style, rating and label.

58. **(Original)** The method of claim 56, wherein the XML schema comprises at least one tag associated with a URL associated with data pertaining to the CD.

59. **(Original)** The method of claim 56, wherein the XML schema comprises at least one tag associated with a URL associated with data pertaining to cover art for the CD.

60. **(Original)** The method of claim 56, wherein the XML schema comprises at least one tag associated with a URL associated with data pertaining to a purchasing experience.

61. **(Previously Presented)** A method of processing media content comprising:

receiving a physical ID that corresponds to a specific DVD upon which content resides that can be experienced by a user;

attempting to map the physical ID to a logical ID;

if no logical ID is found that corresponds to the physical ID, attempting to establish a logical ID for the physical ID by causing a user interface (UI) to be presented to a user via a client computer so that information pertaining to the user's specific media can be collected from the user;

if a logical ID is found that corresponds to the physical ID, searching a database that contains metadata associated with the DVD by using the logical ID as a basis for a search query;

formatting the metadata in a XML schema; and

returning the formatted metadata to a client, wherein different instances of a specific DVD with the same content thereon are associated with different physical IDs that are mappable to the same logical ID.

62. **(Original)** The method of claim 61, wherein the XML schema comprises tags associated with one or more of: a title, studio, lead performer, director, rating, and genre.

63-68. (Cancelled)

69. (Previously Presented) A method of processing media content comprising:

generating a physical ID that corresponds to a specific media upon which content resides that can be experienced by a user on a client computer, wherein different instances of the specific media with the same content thereon are associated with different physical IDs that are mappable to a same logical ID;

sending the physical ID to a server configured to return metadata associated with the specific media;

attempting to map the physical ID to a logical ID;

if no logical ID is found that corresponds to the physical ID, attempt to establish a logical ID for the physical ID by causing a user interface (UI) to be presented to a user via a client computer so that information pertaining to the user's specific media can be collected from the user;

if a logical ID is found that corresponds to the physical ID, searching a database that contains metadata associated with the specific media by using the logical ID as a basis for a search query;

receiving, from the server, XML-formatted metadata;

parsing, with the client computer, the XML-formatted metadata; and

displaying the metadata for the user on the client computer.

70. **(Original)** The method of claim 69, wherein the specific media comprises a CD.

71. **(Original)** The method of claim 69, wherein the specific media comprises a DVD.

72. **(Original)** A method of providing metadata to a client comprising:
establishing a table that contains user-provided entries that map physical IDs to logical IDs, the physical IDs corresponding to specific media upon which content resides that can be experienced by various users, the logical IDs being configured for use in querying one or more databases that contain metadata associated with the specific media, the metadata being returnable to a client;

statistically evaluating the entries to determine, for each physical ID, a most likely logical ID match; and

making the most likely logical ID match available so that it can be used to query the one or more databases.

73. **(Original)** The method of claim 72, wherein said making comprises providing the logical ID into a trusted table of physical ID-to-logical ID mappings.

74. **(Original)** A method of providing metadata to a client comprising:

- providing a table containing user-provided entries that map physical IDs to logical IDs, the physical IDs corresponding to specific media upon which content resides that can be experienced by various users, the logical IDs being configured for use in querying one or more databases that contain metadata associated with the specific media, the metadata being returnable to a client;
- computing, from the table, a list of physical IDs that are to be statistically evaluated;
- for each listed physical ID, ascertaining the logical IDs that have been associated with it by users;
- computing a distribution of logical IDs for a given physical ID, the distribution describing, for each logical ID, the number of times the physical ID has been mapped thereto;
- adding to the distribution, an entry that corresponds to a current trusted logical ID mapping;
- weighting the added entry; and
- computing, from the distribution, a most likely physical ID to logical ID match.

75. **(Original)** The method of claim 74 further comprising updating a

canonical table of trusted mappings with the most likely physical ID to logical ID match.

76. **(Original)** The method of claim 74, wherein said computing a most likely physical ID to logical ID match comprises:

computing a distribution count that sums the total number of times a physical ID has been mapped to a logical ID;

calculating, for each logical ID, a percentage as a function of the summed distribution count; and

selecting a logical ID that has a percentage that meets predefined criteria.

(9) Appendix of Evidence

None.

(10) Appendix of Related Proceedings

None.